

*Application No. 10/811672*  
*Page 5*

*Amendment*  
*Attorney Docket No. H01.2B-11499-US01*

**Amendments To The Drawings:**

Enclosed please find replacement sheet for Figure 1, in which the boxes 56, 58, 60, 62 and 64, which were shown as inputs to regulators 40 and 42, have been cancelled. Instead a single box for the "travel direction sensor" 60, "load sensor" 58 and the "lifting height sensor" 56, are shown as inputs to the brake control device 18 (the dotted line box). This change is believed to be fully supported by originally filed claims 6 and 7, which make it clear that these three sensors are inputs to the brake control device 18.

Delay 54 has been moved to follow box 50, which is supported by the original specification as follows.

*Application No. 10/811672*  
*Page 6*

*Amendment*  
*Attorney Docket No. H01.2B-11499-US01*

**Remarks**

This Amendment is in response to the final Office Action dated **November 25, 2005**. The Examiner has objected to claim 1 and indicated that claims 1-7 would be allowable if the objections were fixed. The Examiner continues to object the drawings as including new matter, particularly as directed to sensors 56, 58, 60, 62 and 64, relative to regulators 40 and 42.

Applicant has fixed claim 1 as requested and the claims are believed in condition for allowance.

Upon further review, applicant sees that original claims 6 and 7 indicated that the "travel direction sensor" was input to the "brake control device" 18, that the "load sensor" was input to the "brake control device" 18 and that the "lifting height sensor" was input to the "brake control device" 18.

Therefore, applicant has proposed some drawing changes, in which the boxes for 56, 58, 60, 62 and 64 have been cancelled, and a single box for the "travel direction sensor" 60, "load sensor" 58 and the "lifting height sensor" 56, are shown as inputs to the brake control device 18 (the dotted line box). This is believed to be fully supported by the original claims 6-7 and specification as filed, and merely conforms the drawings to the original claims.

Time delay 54 has also been moved on the drawings, to conform to the specification as filed, and claim 5 as filed, which shows that the time delay follows box 50, and is an input to first braking device 12.

This is believed to overcome the new matter rejection to the drawings. A formal drawing will be filed if the proposed Figure 1 is indicating as approved.

*Application No. 10/811672*  
*Page 7*

*Amendment*  
*Attorney Docket No. H01.2B-11499-US01*


Claims 1-7, as currently amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: March 27, 2006

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Richard A. Arrett

Registration No.: 33153

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000  
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185  
Telephone: (952) 563-3000  
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

f:\wpwork\raa\11499us01\_amd\_20060327.doc